

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 19, 2008. Claims 18-28 are pending. Claims 18 and 23 are in independent form. Claims 18-27 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 18-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in the Office Action. It is believed that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

In addition, Claims 18, 19, 23-25 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0153597 (Kanai et al.), and Claims 21, 22, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from *Kanai* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0172223 (Ying et al.).

As shown above, Applicant has amended the claims to clarify still further what Applicants regard as their invention. With the claims rendered clearer, Applicant believes, at least for the following reasons, that independent Claims 18 and 23, and the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable over the prior art.

Claim 18 is directed to an information processing apparatus capable of communication with an external apparatus connected thereto. The claimed apparatus

comprises two USB controllers (a USB device controller and a USB host controller) and a connection unit having a plurality of connectors.

In the claimed information processing apparatus, a switching unit determines the type of the connected apparatus, and if it is determined that the connected apparatus is the USB device apparatus, the switching unit connects the USB device apparatus with the USB host controller. On the other hand if it is determined that the connected apparatus is the USB host apparatus, the switching unit connects the USB host apparatus with the USB device controller.

By using the switching unit, the apparatus of Claim 18 can provide suitable connections between the connected apparatus and the controller corresponding to the determined type of the external apparatus, if any one of USB device apparatus and USB host apparatus is connected to the connection unit.

Thus, by virtue of the switching unit, and the above-mentioned control thereof, the use of each connector is not fixed to just the USB device apparatus or just the USB host apparatus. This means that each connector can be used for connecting the USB host apparatus with the USB device controller, and the USB device apparatus with the USB host controller, in order to provide suitable connection for each connected apparatus.

Kanai relates to techniques pertaining to a communication control semiconductor device having a plurality of connectors, as shown in Figs. 5 and 7. Applicants submit, however, that nothing in *Kanai* would teach or suggest a switching unit having the features recited for the switching unit in Claim 18.

According to Fig. 5 of *Kanai*, a device connected to a connector 2 (31B) and connector 3 (31C) is provided with connections with a host controller or function controller

using multiplexer 1 (29) or 2 (30). However, as is described in [0063], the use of each connector is fixed, that is, connector 2 is *only* for function device 200, and connector 3 is *only* for host device 100.

Furthermore, in Fig. 5 and 7, there is a connector 1, in addition to connectors 2 and 3. Connector 1 is not connected to a USB host controller 23 via a switching unit, and thus should be out of consideration as having anything to do with the features of Claim 18.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that nothing in *Kanai* would teach or suggest the recited switching unit of Claim 18, and submits therefore that that claim is allowable over *Kanai*.

Independent Claim 23 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 18, and is believed to be patentable over *Kanai* for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 18.

A review of the other art of record, including *Ying*, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of independent Claims 18 and 23, and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCBS_WS 2810035v1